Van Zile's I per cent above—making 31 per cent of favoritism. The reason for this favoritism may be found in Mr. Mather's statement, that shortly before the work was let, he was informed his relative had an interest. He Bays:—

I know the firm of Fisher & Co.; they are F. H. Fisher and Jacob Groat; they are men of very moderate means; lock No. 50 was awarded to Josse Van Zile, whose partner is Daniel Wright: Wright married a sister of my wife who is now deceased; Benjumin Marshall, Jonas C. Heartt, and other leading elthers of Troy, which due to exert my influence in favor of obtaining work for bir. Van Zile; Mr. Hunt for Mr. Marshall, stated that he (Van Zile) was a hard working, industrious mechanic, a most oscillent workman, and an hon at man, that he never undertook a job without going through with it; that he felt exceedingly anxious that he should obtain some work at this letting, and though he differed with me politically, they trusted that would be no obstacle to my interesting myself in his behalf for work, Mr. Marshall was to be one of his securities. I took die not his bids were reasonable. I should most certainly interest myself in his favor, at this time, and for some time after. I was not aware of any persons being interested with him in any shape whatever, nor was I aware of it than I a abort time before the work was declared off; I then I traned for the first, that Mr. Wright was a partner with him, that having been kept from me up to this time by Mr. Wright; there was so much interest manifected by the clitzens of Troy in favor of Mr. Van Zile, to whom it was an entire stranger, that I felt andone to manifected by the clitzens of Troy in favor of Mr. Van Zile, to whom it was an entire stranger, that I felt andone to

I will give the committee one more illustration of the most safe and accountageous terms of award-

Sec. 51 to	56, J. Healey & Co 57, J. Jackson & Co 58 S. Brown	17,425	Estimate, \$23,964 25,115 49,912 27,011
		\$86,997	\$126.032 86.997
62, V 78, 11	ardinier andenburgh P. Alexander v. O. Story	52,243	\$30.035 Estimate, \$27.142 52,249 23,590 50,723
-		\$131,438	\$132,797 131,438

Here are eight sections estimated at \$258,769, four of which are let at one per cent below the estimate, and the other four at thirty-one per cent. This is the result of making political "points" in letting contracts. The sections awarded at \$131,435 to favorites, might have been let, on safe and advantageous terms, to contractors at \$93,437, or a saving to the State of \$13,000. This was the modus operands by which the favorites and relatives were provided for and taken care of by the contracting board. In my judgment, there has been a goss violation of official dary, a violation of law, and a contempt of the instructions of the Canal Board, solely to show favoritism; and if that is not corruption, when done in pecuniary transactions, I should like to knew what is Every defence or avology fails as you examine it. The estimates were not quite a guide, and the terms of the bills were not quite a guide. Was the ability of the parties a guide? I have a list of some few of these able bidders, and the amount of work they are to do towards the completion of the public works. Commencing at the west, I find allotted to such sturdy contractors as Here are eight sections estimated at \$258,769

V. Colt. 60.752 H. Richardson, for Col. Abel, for 251, 252, 254 127.083

\$1,349,758 To these men of ability may be added these help-

mates:

J. Upton, of Albany, C'atable. Mr. Dimick, late Senator.

A. G. Danby, of Utica. Mr. Spaulding, of Bull'sio
Gien. Nye, Madison. Mr. Schoolcraft. of Alb'y
Bloses Hatch, Oswego.

S. M. Burroughs, Orleans. Mr. Kellogg, of Utica.

A. G. Danby, of Utica.

Gen. Nye, Madison.

Mr. Schoolcraft. of Alby.

Mr. Matteson of Oneida.

Mr. Kellogg, of Utica.

These are some of the experienced contractors, or rather the band of political intriguers, the mea of "ability," to whom contracts were awarded from favoritism, and to whom the rich revenues of the canal have been transferred for an indefinite time to come, unless you annut these wastful lettings. Sec. 366, for \$69,400, was awarded to Palmeter & Witliams. Why? Because the terms proposed by them were "most safe and advantageous to the State, due regard being had to price, the ability of the parties and the security offered?" By what right or authority could Mr. Cook compel them to transfer the contract to Clark & Teft for the benefit of Spaulding? If the award to them was made conditional, then it was not legal. As to the contracts of N. S. King, the affidavit of Abram Van Vechten shows the motive of taking in Col. Mather, not as an equal partner, but as a two-thirder. Van Vechten says:

I am acquainted with the different members of the Canal and Letting Board; I supposed that combinations must be made in order to be successful. Mr. King aupposed his chances, as a silver-gray, to be very bad; I am a whig; I never had any conversation with any member of either board in regard to the best method of forming combinations to insure success: before the final award was made, and after the first and seend slates were broken up. I went to Mr. Calvin E. Mather, and told him that I had an interest with Mr. King in certain bids, and that if he was a mind to, he might have an interest sito; thereupon Mr. King and myself executed a transfer or assignment of two-thirds of our joint interest in the bids in which we were interested, and of which we had the sole control to Mr. Mather; our object in this was to secure Mr. Mather's interest with some members of the Board; I made this proposition to Mr. Mather; and told him that I was to exert myself in the advancement of their proposition; there a brother of one o

The attention of the witness being likewise directed to sections 316 and 317, awarded to J. N. Stage, witness was

scetions 510 and 517, awarded to J. N. Stage, witness was as ked—
Are these democratic allotments?
A.—Yes, both of them.
Q.—Do you know of any other person or persons being directly or indirectly interested with Mr. Stage in the contracts on these sections?
A.—I appear that Mr. Orson Tousley and John D. Lee of Albion, are interested with him. I have been informed that my son has an interest in one or both of them. A factime Mr. Stage spoke to me about work, I told him as he was an old friend of mine, if his propositions were right I felt strongly disposed to give him work. Then, and for month after, my son was in California; he returned the latter part of Cetober, and after Mr. Stage's propositions had been put in, I learned, not from my son, or i think from Stage, that my son was to be interested with Stage. The first opportunity I got after this I spoke to my son about it, and told him if it was so, I was sorry for it, not that I considered there was any wrong in it, as he was of age and acted for himself, but that there were enough in the world to find fault, and say it was wrong, as I was to have something to do with the awarding of the contracts. He said he had some econversation with Mr. Stage, but did not give me to understand what interest he was to have in the world. I told him I hoped it would be aone: I do not now know what interest he has, if any.

From this it appears the propositions were put in before Mr. Follett's son returned from California. Now, why did Mr. Stage give young Follett an in-terest? Why mention the fact to the father? But, terest? Why mention the fact to the father? But, says the State officer, conscious of the impropriety of his son's having an interest. I told him "I hoped he would have no interest." Why then give Mr. Stage so many sections at such high prices? If he really hoped his son should have no interest, he could easily have let this work to the numerous lower biddiers, and his hope would have been realized. As regards Sawin & Barnes, to whom a section was assigned when they did not bid. Sawin is a good carpenter, but neither of them would be selected for qualification as contractors. There was some other reason for giving them the job. Hiram P. Mills, testifies:—

After the awards were made I was called into the office After the awards were made I was called into the off division were being delivered, and Mr. Stilison, the division were being delivered, and Mr. Stilison, the dision engineer, requested his clerk. Mr. Parker, to have the proposition made by Harwood and myself, on the fact of which there was an assignment written for seed 275. Mr. Stillson had previously seed Mr. Parket to the Mr. Stillson had previously seed Mr. Parket to the distribution of the distribution of the Mr. Stillson what the objects and the distribution of th chestry to give these mensione week, or that the board-hed to to it. I signed the assignment before I signed a contracts which were arrived to say Hellis White says;
I was in Mr. Seymour's room twice; on both eccasions he sent for me to know on what sections I had bid; tha first time I did not give him a list. for I had none; the second time I gave him a list. The bids I was interested in did not give my name on the canvass which he had made out. I have an interest also with decorge Reynali & Co., on section 334 and two cutverts; Solomon Parmetee, George Anthony, and myself form the company. About a week after election I was sick at Buffslo, and sent for Mr. Parmetee to make the bids for the company; I then first proposed to him to form a partnership; I cannot tell why Mr. Parmetee consented to associate me with him on these bids.

\$19,561 A sacrifice on these two sections as between

A sacrifice on these two sections as between these two parties, of. \$24,334

H. V. Colt.—Who Mr. Colt is, and why he was a favorite, Commissioner Cook says—"I know H. V. Colt; he is a son of Senator Colt, of Geneaee; I do not know he was ever a contracter before, but I should think him competent for a reasonable amount of work, particularly for section work." D. H. Richardson, contracts for Col. Abell. Canal Commissioner Cook says—"David H. Abell was present at Cagger's while we were there; upon whose invitation he came I do not know; he seemed to participate and talk with the different members, of the qualifications of the bidders, &c.; I think he had a set of books containing the bids, and when we were at work at any particular piece of work, he would look at, or refer to these books, and he also helped to keep minutes, as did also a young man from Mr. Cagger's office, sent up for that purpose." Again—"I do not know where Abell is; I have not seen him since he was in Albany; Abell was understood to be interested in the proposition of D. H. Richardson; he spoke to me in relation to this, but not, to my recollection, for any one else, or in regard to any other proposition." Of the rest of the gentlemen of ability, I will refer to the testimony to show how they obtained contracts. Mr. Kellogg gives this account of the J. B. Rice contract:—

Mesers. Utley, Bates, Howe and Webb obtained contracts which were, as far as I was interested in them, on sections 126, 128, 130 (Mr. Utley's), 129 (Bakes'), 140, 141 (Webb's assigned to Howe afterwards), 144, 145 (Howe's); there are some culverts also awarded to Mr. Howe on sections 129 and 141. Those interested with myself and Utley & Bates in their bids above, were Mr. Mattison of Utlea, and with myself and Howe and Webb, Judge Nye of Madison county. A. G. Duby of Utica, Delos De Well of Oswego, and Mr. Mattison. These contracts were awarded on the bids as put in; the latter were not altered to my knowledge; I have also an interest obtained since awarded on the bids as put

Of Messrs. Burroughs' and Hatch's interest Commissioner Follett says:—

He named Mr. Hatch, of Oswego, Mr. Burroughs, of Medina, Mr. T. D. Barton, of Buffsio, and I think, one or two others. (I would say that neither Hatch nor Burroughs had contracts in their own names, but are supposed to be interested with others.) He had tried on the slate; he undertook to exclude them, but could not, and did not now blame anybody.

Wm. Beldwin also says:—

Lock No. 17 was awarded to Philo Storms, of Oswego; his bid was something less than one thousand dollars higher than mine; I gave him a thousand dollars for his interest in his centract; the contract was made, prepared for him to sign; a new sontract, or the same one, was altered for me to sign, at our joint request; Mr. Stevens is a miller, and never, to my knowledge, engaged in any work of the kind; Mr. Moses P. Hatch, of Oswego, told me he had an interest in getting this contract for Stevens; I have known Stevens for about two years; he told me, I think, that he had never done any such work; my bid on locks 14 and 12, awarded to A. B. Dickinson, was about \$9,000 less than his; I feel condident, from my experience and knowledge, that I could have made money on my bids.

I ask the reading again of G. W. Baldwin's affi-

is. I ask the reading again of G. W. Baldwin's affi-

I ask the reading again of G. W. Batawin's am-dayit, to show how this assignment of bids was ma-naged. I wish to show by this the modus operandi by which they forced me to assign contracts. I renaged. I wish to show by this the modus operandic by which they forced me to assign contracts. I refer to it, too, to show the manner in which the taking of verbal bids would operate. Scaled proposals are received—they are opened; and if collusion were possible to be credited in this Canal Board, it opened the way for collusion with favorite bidders. This is a thing never heard of. What, a verbal bid in our public works? If there was nothing else, this would stamp fraud upon the contracts, such as to call for action on the part of this house. And yet we find the members of this Legislature coming here with a report, and placing it on file, approving of these verbal bids! Look at the testimony of Baldwin. He had come down here for a contract, but had returned, supposing that he had received none. A telegraphic despatch from Kellogg brings him back. The Board has seen fit to award him a centract, but compels him to assign it to those "four or five worthy poor men"—embracing George Law & Co..--a contract worth \$10,000, for \$75. Notice the fact of Follett coming into the private and locked up room of Law & Co. with an armful of contracts. What does this mean, if this innocent letting board are ignorant of all the outside movements? With all this outside pressure—with all this brokerage going on—will gentlement tell us there was no fraud, no corruption? Is it strange the Canal Board pursued no system of action—letting contracts at one time too high for the interest of the State! Happy people, to have such accommodating State officers! It would seem that my friend from Columbia, (Mr. Van Santvoord,) who seems anxious to see the ghost, and whose vision so far has not been bleased, might see such accommodating State officers: It would seem that my friend from Columbia, (Mr. Van Santvoord,) who seems anxious to see the ghost, and whose vision so far has not been blessed, might see in some of these transactions the shadew of guilt, or at least, the ghost of a fraud. Before I leave this branch of the subject, I must refer to the new theory in government. It seems that in this age of progress, fraud has found a new hiding piace under "political favoritism." It is approved of by the majority report of the select committee, approved of by one of the minority reports, and now only waits the confirmation of the Legislature to be incorporated into the Guide Book for State officers, thus establishing a safe basis for accepting proposals for sale of public stocks, or receiving contracts for public works; and also a safe rule for the disbursement of public moneys; always preserving the "half and half" principle, cautiously guarding the pecuniary proportions between political partisans, always seeing that proper convenient on are made from the different columns when the high are mixed thirded or principle, catactusing guarding the pecuniary proportions between political partisans, always seeing that proper compensations are made from the different columns when the bids are mixed, thirded, or haived. Novel doctrine in political and moral philosophy. Soothing epithets for violation of public trusts. I have, as it were, as protracted as this examination of testimony on my part has been, only taken a glance at this mountain of guilt. Its dark and hidden recesses are yet unexplored—its towering height, its gigantic proportions, which startle belief and stagger imagination have not yet been surveyed. But I am forced to quit these details, to come to the consideration of the conclusions which they force upon me. I now come to a summary of conclusions. The evils attending a confirmation of the lettings, now that the public knows how and why they were made, no one of us can foresee. Ist. I have shown from the evidence now upon your table, that before the estimates were made or the proposals put in, an arrangement was entered into between Mesers Follet, Mather and Seymour, to divide the work equally between the two political divide the work equally between the two political parties, on condition that a large amount of work should be given to a particular individual, and from parties, on condition that a large amount of work should be given to a particular individual, and from the fact that Mr. Seymour and that individual are largely connected in a western enterprise. I draw the inference that Mr. Seymour was improperly influenced if not corrupted in his official action; as larvam action must be measured by an adequate fortive, and there was no attempt in his testing to show that the motive to give Law three millifults of contracts, and the large amount that he finally got in his own name and with others, was, "because it was advantageous to the interests of the State." The evidence of this argument is unmistakeable, and the inference logical and fair. If you approve of the argument, say so; if you approve of the argument, say so; if you approve of Mr. Seymour and Mr. Law's connection, say so, and do not shrink from the responsibility. 2d. I have shown from the evidence the monator the letting board proceeded in dividing the work equally between the two parties, each side designating the person to have the contract, and taking care of his own political friends. I have shown from the evidence, that contracts at the expectation of the evidence, that contracts at

friends, and in many instances to the relatives of the members of the letting board—that if the estimates of the hopiners are uniform; at the committee of the work at a best the scientists, while the board determined to bring the aggregate 10 per cent below, thus latting portions of the work at a four 20 to 20 per cent below, thus latting portions of the work at a four 20 to 20 per cent below, thus latting portions of the work at a four 20 to 20 per cent below, thus latting the scientists of feed, as the letting board did not pay a due regard to prices, nor to the ability of the parties or the securities of feed, as the law commanded them; that the whole scheme of the letting is a favoritism so gress as to be undestinguishable form corruption. That it was the undestinguishable form corruption. That it was the undestinguishable form corruption. That is well as the undestinguishable form corruption. That is well as the undestination of the correction of a sound discretion the board judged the Rigniner's estimates most safe and advantageous to the State," which would have given the scientism to the State, "to let the work it Depends to the state," the scientism is of the state of the scientism is decide whether the board acted with a proper discretion in solecting bidders, giving an advance of thirty per cent to their friends and relatives, and to such parties as could bring a strong indusence to bear upon the board; if the house is of the opinion that this can be done without frund, it will covered the majority and result of the scientism is of poinion that the board acted properly, in rejecting the programm of John T. Clark, for the distribution of the work on the middle division of the Brit Canal and the Owergo looks, in order to sward contracts to J. B. Rice, Squire Uley, A. G. Dauly, Judge Nye. A. R. Dickinson, Smator Dirmink, M. C. Story, and others of like state of the majority of the a feed of the majority of the a feed of the majority of the relatives, if ends, and thory is not a public and the second pof fastened like the barnacles which gather on the bottom and sides of the noble ship, cating out and rotting out her strength, until she, ne longer able to rise on the mountain wave, sinks a miserable hulk into the unfathomed depths of the ocean. The occasion is unworthy of party reference, but the gentleman from Tompkins forces the subject on me. He referred to a recent election in Buffalo. I would say that the defeated candidate for Mayor was an intimate friend of a contractor, if not interested, and the principal democrat defeated was a contractor. If the gentleman could make anything out of this, he was welcome to it. The gentleman from Tompkins lad said the democratic party was pledged to carryout the Eric Canal bill. In his liberal construction of the pledge we are also pledged to overlook all the favoritism and frauds in the execution of the liw, especially if the allotments were "half and half," the D. and W. column is evidently footed, and the scales are kept in the centre. Sir, I admit that pledge, and the democratic party is now willing, not only to live up to that pledge, but also to the cmal resolution of the Syracuse Convention which le ascribes to me. Was that pledge—that "bond," if it suits the gentleman any better—to be held in terorem over the democratic party, to close their eyer and seal their lips to these official depredations on the Eric Canal? If we acquiesce in these frauds, we become accessories—sink even below a political contractor, below his stool pigeon or his scape-goat. Early in January I did say on this floor, in speaking of a portion of the present beard, who belonged to the letting board:—

If there are any members of that board who, throug If there are any members of that board who, throug over-persuasion of friends, or error of judgment, have become implicated in these lettings, there is still an opportunity or correcting their error, removing all suspicion of corruption, and doing justice to the State and them selves. If this opportunity is lost now, it is lost forever-like the moments of time now passing before us, one passed, it will be lost forever-once gone it can never return; and they must stand by what has been done, an abide the consequence in all future time as principals.

sind the consequence in all future time as principals.

Sir, that warning was in vain. Had they then acted and done their duty to the state and themselves, and rid the canal of these fraudulent lettings, and annulied such portions of the lettings as political profligates had seized upon, and promptly re-let the work to honest and experienced contractors, the lower competent and responsible bidders, as law and honesty enjoined them to do, our public works would have been resumed in honest hands, and our forwarders and our boatmen would hare been emancipated from that iniquitous bond which not only pledged the revenue of the Eric Canal, but bound them and the tax-payers of this State in all time to come in moral and political vassalage to them. The Eric Canal Enlargement must be rescued—must be saved. There is no other course to save it, and no other object in this world could have induced me into my present course to stand up here and beard such a powerful and corrupt combination. Now, sir, I protest against the views of the gentleman from Tompkins, so far as the democratic party is concerned. Heretofore I have referred to the birth of this off-spring of the Eric Canal bill, its putative fathers and acconchers, but now this discarded child of all parties is held up to the altar of democracy by the gentleman from Tompkins, and waited upon by some State officers, who are equally determined it shall be christened, and who are its willing sponsors; and we are called upon to baptise it in the name of the democratic party and adopt it into the democratic family. Adopt what? The blackest bastard of the blackest portion of the whig party. I say God forbid? Shall we sanction these lettings, repudiated so far even by a whig majority as there was in the Canal Board before the 1st of January, which refused to acknowledge them!—rejected by the courts so far—shall the democratic majority of the Canal Board, or of the democratic party in this House, by their votes, put the seal of the State of New York to these nefarious letti Sir, that warning was in voin. Had they ther

that you will close the column, and that the democratic party shall be found sight on the record.
But, sir, these references to more party considerations are unbecoming the great question we are discussing. The financial consequences are important,
as they shall affect the ordeit of this State, upon
which we rely for the completion of our internal improvements; and without public confidence in it they
must stop. Such a question, it is superfluous for me
to say, deserves grave consideration; but time will
not justify their discussion now by me. However
much we may value our public credit, and the loss
of millions to be squandered on political proligacy,
yet this is insignificant when contemplating and
estimating the moral consequences which must
flow from the ratification of these illegal and
fraudulent acts of our State officers. It concerns
the very perpetuity of our infant republic, and the
progress of self-government. In other countries,
the strength of the government lies in their standing armies, their fortresses—but our strength lies
in the integrity of the government, the purity and
honesty of public officers, and the virtue and intelligence of the people. When public officers become
corrupt, and official delinquences go unpunished, the
confidence of the people is withdraw from the government. Whatfollows?—anarchy, anarchy. Although geographically our State has boundaries,
yet in its moral influences, it has no boundaries
in this republic, except those two oceans which
wash our shores. Our vote to-night is to set
an example which will be felt throughout the
Union, whether it is in acquiescence, or in condemnation of official dishonesty; whether it is
in submission to the infany of our State or in
vindication of her honor. Sir, I will not follow this
subject. The lateness of the hour as well as the
time I have occupied, admonish me that I must
bring my remarks to a close. In all contests there
must be a beginning and an end—a defect or victory—the conquered and conquerers—and it matter field—justice will be done, and my viotor, like his classic producessor, will soon meat an ignoble fake. It is not in my nature to forebode danger. It is rather my temperament to combat misfortune, a fortune as it shall rise in my path—overcome it if I can, submit to it passively if I must. In the early part of this session, under a high sense of duty I owed the State, I warned members of this House, that I crisis was foreshadowing itself. I saw before me this great State, heretofore proud of her commanding position in this Union; proud of her commence, now whitening the sea; proud of her internal improvements, unsurpassed in either past or modern history, and which in their wide-spread utility, were diffusing their blessing to the countless thousands who throng our shores. I saw her so steeped in corruption, so degraded her strong arm, heretofore potent to protect herself and her defenders, dropping nervilessly by her side, so weak, so powerless, that although her dignities and honors were not sold in the market place, as in the last days of the Roman empire, yet her honor, her vestal honor was violated, prostituted in sight of this capitol with unblashing shamelessness by the guardians chosen by the people, and her treasury robbed by its professed protectors, without even that sometimes redeeming courage, that dashing boldness, that saves the robber from the gallows. An honorable gentleman remarked the other day that "the present is not all of time." No, it is not all of time!—there is a future—a future for States as well as individuals, but the future of individuals is of little account in the events of time. They are but the bubbles upon its dark, vast current, which is hourly sweeping its countless multitudes into the ocean of eternity, but the future of a State is unending, it is thronged with unborn millions. It is on that future that your action to-night is to impress the seal of justice, honesty, and truth. What then shall be your vote, and what your action? Will you fold your arms, and without an effo

Justice has triumphed! Record then your names to-night on the side of the honor of your State. All other actions of your life shall soon be forgotten. The very tombstone erected by friendship, on which your names shall be registered, on which perhaps the hand of affection may inscribe some memento to your virtues, in vain efforts at immortality. All—all shall crumble into dust, and the grass shall grow over the last vestage of you on earth still your Fint Justitia ! all shall crumble into dust, and the grass shall grow over the last vestage of you on earth, still your names shall stand recorded in the journals of this House undimmed by time, and your actions to night shall form part of the history of this great State. It will contain the memorial of your fidelity to justice, and the honor of your State in her darkest hour, or a damning record of your cowardice, your treachery and your corruption. Achieve then this triumphyour ambition need seek no prouder monument in this world—for your names, your virtues, shall live in the hearts and memories of all true and good men who shall come after you—live—yes, live forever—forever. forever.

New Military Telegraph.

This is the telegraphic age. Our own country is wired over with telegraph lines. We may shortly expect to see our vast territory placed under an immense ctric sieve, spreading from the Atlantic to th Pacific, and from the Aurora Borealis to the Equator. The electric wires, too, are extending in Europe, to all points, connecting despotisms with constitutional countries, and bringing all parts of the European Continent within a flash of London. Asia will next, we suppose, be brought under the finger of the telegraphic operator in London and New York. Then, the daily occurrences of Pekin, Constantinople, St. Petersburg, Vienns, Berlin. Rome, Paris, London, Washington, and San Fran cisco, will be published the next meraing in the NEW YORK HERALD.

Since the discovery of the magnetic and electric telegraphs, another mode of communication has started into existence for the exclusive use of armies This system of telegraph consists of two bases :--

1st. To use nothing but what the soldiers carry with them.

2d. To ask nothing of the men but a uniform mechanical movement with which the minds of the

soldiers have nothing to do. This system, which was invented and perfected by Mr. James Swaim, of Philadelphia, who lately returned in the Baltie from Europe, is simple and methodical in its operation, and renders all confusion and false interpretation impossible. The speed is very satis-factory, and it has been shown that from thirteen

factory, and it has been shown that from thirteen to fifteen double signals can be made in a minute, over an extended field of military operations or evolutions.

We learn that this telegraph has been tried, with the most satisfactory results, by the military authorities of Wurtemburg, France, and England. In France, many highly successful experiments were made between the forts of Vincennes and the environments of the distance of savagamiles, the surrounding forts, to the distance of seven miles, the distance depending upon the quality of the spy glass currounding forts, to the distance of seven miles, the distance depending upon the quality of the spy glass. Some will permit a correspondence between Fort Nogent and Mount Valerien, which is the greatest distance—twelve miles—between the belts of forts around Paris; and in case the distance is too great, intermediate posts can be established. The men used for the experiments had no need of instruction beforehand: they were taken at Tandom from the army whenever they were wanted. A standing telegraphic corps is not, therefore, necessary. Experiments with the night telegraph were made between Vincennes and Nogent (two and a half miles) with simple tallow candles surrounded with paper, and notwithstanding the inconvenience of this kind of light, the experiments were successful. For a night telegraph it is, of course, indispensable that the size of the light should be according to the distance.

This is a brief outline of the new telegraph. In all great military operations widely extended, it will be of considerable value in preventing mistakes, in giving information from extreme points to the commander-in-chief, and saving time in the transmission of orders. The system is, of course, useless tor any other purpose. Electricity annihilates every thing else for the occurrences of every day life.

Elections of Governors of the Alms House To the Edition of the Healb.

The law provides that two governors are to be elected at the same time, but that no elector shall vote for more than one. The two candidates having the highest number of votes are declared duly

it necessarily follows, that the two candidates no-

in a the absolute and unchecked appointment of one-instead by the two great parties, respectively, must be the persons elected. In other words, the whig nominating convention as the absolute and unchecked appointment of one-palf the governors, and the democratic convention he other half.

e other nam. The pretended election by the people is all moon-Louis Napoleon on the French electors.

This single board has the authority to increase the taxes of the city of New York, at will, to any

Are the two political nominating conventions epositories of the power of appointment?
To whom, and to what extent, are they responsi-te for the exercise of this power?
Let the citizens who foot the bills answer.

ONE OF THE VICTIMS Yours.

Architcher Hughes Cathelic Chapter.
No. 3.

Warbington, Merch 31, 1852.

THE "BILLY QUESTION"—THE IS A PROTESTANT COUNTER—THE CONSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT PROTESTANT—RQUALITY OF RIGHTS TO ALIENS, A GRANT, &C.—MILITARY SERVICES OF CATHOLICS OF ALCHRISHOF HUGHES, &C.

IR. BENNETT:—

SECTS, &C.—TOLERATION A PROTESTANT GRANT—EQUIVORS OF ARCHISINOP RUGHES, &C.

MR. BENNETT:—

In reference to the religious liberty onjoyed by Roman Catholics in this country, Archbishop Hughes says:—"It has been asked why Catholica in America do not procure, or at least petition for similar alterations of the laws in favor of Protestands, in such countries as Italy, Spain, and Portugal." He thinks this, he says, "a very silly question"—az "Catholica in America have no more to do with the civil governments of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, than they have to do with those of Engiand, Russia, or Turkey."

Well, if they have nothing to do with the civil governments they have something to do with the spiritual—all, in this respect, having the same head, and the church Roman Catholic being one. Might not, then, the members of that church in this country, without being guilty of unwarrantable interference, ask the spiritual head of their church, whom they may always approach as a common father, to use his influence with, at least the avereign ruler of the Papal States—and which, owing to their intimacy, and the friendy relations substating between the two, we might suppose would be considerable—towards the accomplishment of the object in his own domain? What objection can the archbishophaye to this? True, it would not be doing much, but it would be better than nothing. The effort might, indeed most probably would be, unsuccessful. The Fope might tell them he had no influence with the temporal sovereigns of the Papal States, much less with any other—even his prot sctor, Louis Napobut it would be better than nothing. The effort might, indeed most probably would be, unsuccessful. The Pope might tell them he had no influence with the temporal sovereigns of the Papal States, much less with any other—even his protector. Louis Napoleon—and that, as spiritual head of the church, he could not with propriety interfere with the civil ruler at Rome. Such might be the result of the application; still, though nothing at all should be effected, the effort would manifest a liberal disposition—a sympathy for those who are deprived by despotic power of the freedom of speech, and of the press, and of thought, and of conscience, and would evince, also, a proper appreciation of that perfect liberty they here enjoy; and it would prove, also, to their Protestant fellow-citizens that they do not merit the degrading accusation of being friendly to equal rights only where Protestants predominate. And, should the Pope give such an answer as above is supposed, I think they might quite confound "His Holiness" by patting this question to him—When did the Pope relinquish his claim to absolute authority over all temporal governments, which was so conclusively established by Gregory VII' Ho might, however, confound them with this very sapient reply—"My children, you ask a very silly question." But the Archbishop says he might answer that silly question (that which he says has been asked here) "by putting to those who ask it another just as silly: Why do you i rotestants not induce England and the Protestant States of Northern Europe, to initiate the example of this country." &c. It might be replied to the archbishop's question—if the Protestants of this country bore the same relation to the heads of the churchs of the head of their church a respectful memorial and argument, in favor of equal rights to Catholies here bear to the head of the church of England in Maryland, or in the colonies generally, had presented to the head of their church a respectful memorial and argument, in favor of equal rights to Catholies—civi

He says that this is "neither a Catholic or a Protes He says that this is "neither a Catholic or a Protestant country. It is a land of religious freedom and equality; and,! hope, that, in this respect, it shall remain just what it now is to the latest posterity." For the moment when he wrote that sentence he forgot New Hampshire, or doubtless ho would have made a slight reservation. She must still stand as an index tor both Catholics and Protestants—to Catholics, to show them that, while they rejoice that this is a land of religious freedom and equality, they must not forget that for these things they are indebted to the free will of the Protestant people of the States, and are dependent on the same for their continuance; and to Protestants, to warn them of the possibility—and without constant vigilance and exertion the probability—of their own dependence, at some future day, for the same blessings, on a religious sect which never have allowed freedom and equality where they could withhold them with inpunity.

I know that this last assertion is controverted by

I know that this last assertion is controverted by the archbishop, who, in his letter to Mr. Greeley, refers to France, and Belgium, and Bayaria, as Catholic countries allowing equality of civil and religious liberty to Protestants; and he referred also to the proprietary government of Maryland, which allowed the same. But, few persons are ignorant of the fact that in France, Protestants are incibbted for the imperfect liberty they have enjoyed there, to the infide part of the population; in Belgium, to a Protestant King and the influence of the British Empire; and in Bayaria, to Mrs. Heald (Lola Mootics); and I am credibly informed, that since her expulsion and the dethronement of King Lewis by the Jesuits, Protestants have ceased to enjoy equality of rights—both civil and religious—in Bavaria. I will advert to Maryland in the sequel. I know that this last assertion is controverted by

countries take religious denominations from the numerical superiority of sects. Thus, France and Belgium, and Bavaria, are properly enough termed Catholic countries, because Roman Catholics are much more numerous there than Protestants. Maryland, when first settled, was for the same reason called a Roman Catholic settled. called a Roman Catholic colony; and when the Protestants became the more numerous, it became Protestant. And so the kingdoms of England, Swe-den, Denmark and Prussia, and also the United

Protestants. And so the kingdoms of England, Sweden, Denmark and Prussia, and also the United States, are, for the same reason, Protestant comprises—the very learned argument of the archishop to the contrary notwithstanding. He must deliver many more loctures before the people will believe otherwise; and I trust in God mone of those Protestant countries will ever be otherwise in reality, whatever they may be called.

So far merely as the holding of office under the United States is concerned—no religious test being required as a qualification therefor—the federal government is, perhaps, neither Christian, Jewish, Mahomedan, nor Pagan. I maintain, however, that the government and the constitution both are Protestant—both being founded on that great and inalienable right which is natural to every man—the right of each individual to judge for himself in all matters, whether of Church or State. This is the great principle of Protestantism—unfortunately too often abandoned in matters of government by Protestantist themselves—antagonistic to that great principle of Roman Catholic authority. Protestantism in its purity acknowledges no authority under God, in Church or State, but the sovereign will of the people—the only lawful sovereign and divinely constituted depositories of power on the earth. Roman Catholicism, on the contrary, in its purity, claims for the church absolute and unlimited authority over all churches, and all governments. If this claim has been relinquished the intelligence has not yet reached this country. The archbishop acknowledges himself to be graterial for the birthright of civil and political nativity which he admits are conferred on him by the constitution and laws; the same applies to all naturalized citizens; and yet, in connection with the same, he says that, what Catholics are in this country, they are not by favor, but "by positive right." Now, it seems to me, that when the people of the States gave Congress the power to passnaturalization laws, the idea was, that aliens could have no ri

gave Congress the power to passnaturalization laws, the idea was, that aliens could have no rights here without a grant. True, after the laws are made, and the terms complied with, the rights received in consequence are then positive; still, if there is a posi-tive benefit conferred with the right, the latter does not cancel the moral obligation; and the conferring of them was certainly a favor, because it was a spontancous measure, which the granters were under no obligation to perform.

He thinks there are 3.500,000 Roman Catholies at

He tames there are 3,000,000 koman Cathonics at this time in this country. The Catholic Metropoli-tan Almanac, for 1852—the compiler of which, says his information was derived from the most reliable sources—puts down the whole number at 1,989,000, and this includes 250,000 for the diocess of Boston, which was not from a report thence, but his own estimate. This Almanac says there are in all 1,411 churches. They will average, then, according to his account, more than 1,300 to each church, and ac-cording to the estimate of Archbishop Hughes, nearly 2,500 for each.

early 2,500 for each.

He dwells long and earnestly on the revolutions. He dwells long and earnestly on the revolutionary and other military services of the Roman Catholics of this country; but, after all, he first entirely to prove any peculiar merit; and if that was not his object, why so much labor to present them in bold relief! It has never been denied that they stood shoulder to shoulder with Protestants in those trying times, and with them braved the winged deaths of the onemy on the battle-field; but the incentives of the Protestants to a resistance of British oppression were not stronger than those of the Catholics—with the exception of those members of the established church who took sides with independence. The same tyrannical measures that forced the Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, and Baptists to resistance, pressed the Catholics with equal severity; among which there was none more odious than that which compelled them all to pay tribute to a church for which—and for this very reason perhaps—they left freiches \$1.500.

special commendation for their participation in that glorious struggle, it is those of the established church, the few obsergmen in particular, who may aged in the cause of liberty. Unlike the rest, they must lose all by defeat and gain nothing by victory. And as to the patrictism of volunteers to fight the battles of the country, there is but little, I apprehend, to boast of since the revolution. Vest few, I think, would onlist if the reward hold out to them was—in proportion to the estimated labor—less than they could otherwise obtain.

"If," says he, "there had been only one form of Protestantsm professed in all the colonies, I fear much that, even with Washington at their head, the constitution would not have been what it is." That a religious despotiam would have been the consequence there is not much reason to doubt. And, if Roman Catholiciam had been the only form of religion professed in all the colonies, he, and every one clee, knows that the issue would not have been less disastrous to liberty. And yet Archbishep Hughes, with his mind satisfied as to the truth of this, will not dare to rejoice that they were not all Roman Catholics. The Archbishop, then, it seems, rightly concludes that liberty has no security but in a multiplicity of religious seets. So far was are of one mind, and I am happy to discover that we are sustained in this opiniou by so great a mas as Mr. Madison. In "the Federalist, No. 51, he cays: "In a free government, the security for civil rights must be the same as that for religious rights. It consists in the one case in the multiplicity of metrosats, and in the other, in the multiplicity of seets. The degree of security in both cases will depend on the number of interests and seets; and this may be presumed to depend on the extent of country and the number of people comprehended under the same government. And yet, though satisfied of all this, and aware of the otherwise disastrons consequences to liberty, Archbishop Hughes would rejoice to have every man, woman, and child, in this

of States, if the convention had attempted to favor any one of the othors."

Here he changes the ground he took at layer pool before an andience ignorant of our religious history, which was, that the question of religious freedom came up in the convention, and that it was established in consequence of their not being able to agree on any one religious that should be predominant. Now, as such a thing never took place in the convention, it was highly proper in Archhishop Hughes to vary his ground. He also said, at the same time and place, that he had "never found a single instance where Protestantism granted religious freedom where it was in its power to withhold it." And now he admits that the great men who framed the constitution of the United States—to which he gives exclusive credit for our religious freedom." were almost, if not altogether, exclusively Proteatants;" and also that the Catholics were, in this whole country, in the proportion of 40,000 to 3 000-000. There was then no power to hinder the Protestants from excluding Roman Catholics from the enjoyment of religious freedom. And surely the Protestants of the several States—which really have the control of the whole matter—have never bone without power to do the same thing.

I am not aware that Archbishop Hughes has ever unqualifiedly and unequivocally declared kinnelf in favor of the exercise of the rights of conscionce by all people everywhore, as freely and completely as they are recognized in the American Constitution. He had said also—"I have always proached that every denomination, Jews, Christians, Catholics, Protestants of every seet and shade, were all entitled to the entire enjoyment of the freedom of conscionce for all man, as universally as they are not recognized at all in the constitution. He had said also—"I have always proached that every denomination, Jews, Christians, Catholics, Protestants of every seet and shade, were all entitled to the entire enjoyment of the freedom of conscionce." It might pass voy well if he would amend it, by executed and detested liberty of the press." "Noccan we augur more consoling consequences to religion and to government, from the zeal of some teseparate the Church from the Btate, and to burst the bond which unites the priesthood to the empire. For it is clear that this union is dreaded by the profane lovers of liberty only because it has never failed to confer prosperity on both."

Now, how Archbishop Hughes can approve and swallow all this—as he is in duty bound as a paper prelate to do—and be at the same time a sincere friend of our institutions, and wish them God-speed throughout the world—as he is in duty bound to do

throughout the world—as he is in duty bound to do as a republican citizen of the United States—is a question above my ability to solve. I apprehend it will puzzle the archbishop himself.

With great respect, your obedient servent,

JOSIAN F. POUR

Monier Races — Foraria Day — Paiday, March 25. — Jockey Club Purse \$100, three mile heats.

T. B. Patterson's b. f. Bettle Oliver, by Wagner, dam Minstrel, 4 years old.

Lol. S. M. Hill's ch. m. Tulip, by Gray Ragio, dam

Jenkins, 5 years old. Time, 6:04%—5:52. Sixth Day-Saturday, March 26,-Purse \$100, mile

Sixtii DAY-SAT and heats.

R. Reese's ch. g. Thunderbolt, by Thornhill, dam by Levinthan, 5 years old.

R. Mortimer's b. m. Arietta, by Count Badger, out of Queen of Diamonds, 4 years old.

Col. R. H. Long's b. g. Saramac, by Gray Eagle, dam by Medoc, 6 years old.

Time, 1:51-1:31.

Time, 1:51-1:31.

Time, 1:51-1:51.
Second Race.—Purse, 5:250, single dash of three miles
I. French's b. f. Belle Key, by imp. Sovereign, out of by Tonson.
Col. S. M. Hill's b m. Magic, by Yorkshire, dam Mag-Time, 5:51%.

Court of General Sessions.

Before Recorder Tillon.

Aren. 6.—The court respected this morning at 11 o'clock, Joseph Thornton, who was convicted last term on a charge of forgery, was called up for judgment, and sentenced to five years imprisonment in the State prison. No cases being ready to proceed with the court adourned to 11 o'clock Wednesday morning.

RED JACKET'S GRAVE -A movement was lately

RED JACKET'S GRAVE.—A movement was lately started in Buffalo, having for its object the croction of a monument over the grave of the celebrated Indian chief, Red Jacket. A meeting was held, and a proposition made to open a subscription for funds to pay for the monument. At the conclusion of an address on this topic, one of Red Jacket's descendants, (Dr. Wilson,) arose and said:—

GINTLEMEN AND LADIES—I wish to detain you for a moment. I am one of the descendants of Red Jacket. I speak for them. We have been removed from our homes by the cumning treachery of the pale faces. Red Jacket, though not a prophet, nor the zon of a prophet, prother though not a prophet, nor the zon of a prophet, prother of their fathers, and his bones would rest there. But let no pale face touch them. He forbid, in his last moments, the pale face to follow his remains when his spirit should leave them to unite with the Great Spirit. So let the white man not touch them. We the few broken remnants of the Senecas, will boar them away with us. He wants no monument from the hands of the white man—he would not have it. As he forbade the pale faces to follow him to his resting place, so he would forbid them to descerate his bones with their touch. Let not the white man bestow his unthanked benevolence there. Let not the philanthropist go there. Red Jacket wants no meaument. No menument would preverve his name. His name will not perish though he have no monument. He lives if the lives in these hearts of ours and will live as long as one heart beats in the breast of the red man. The white man has done something for him—he has placed a marble slab over them. Where is it now? Fiece by piece the curtous visiter has carried haw, ill carreely one is lett. Should the pale faces build him a monument as high as they propose to build him a monument as high as they propose to build him a monument as high as they propose to build him a monument as high as they propose to build him a monument as high as they propose to build him a monument as high as a lay